



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,026	12/19/2001	Kazuma Sekiya	SAS-0204	9558

7590

11/21/2003

David T. Nikaido
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER, PLLC
Suite 501
1233 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

PRONE, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

10/021,026

Applicant(s)

SEKIYA, KAZUMA

Examiner

Jason Prone

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishiwata et al. in view of Hasenau and Gerber. Ishiwata et al. discloses the invention including a cutting machine (Fig. 7) with a chuck table for holding a work piece (11), an X-axial feeder means for feeding the chuck table with the work piece in an X-axial direction (70), first and second cutting means (22 and 23) each having a spindle arranged in the Y-axial direction perpendicular to the X-axial direction (Fig. 8A), that the first and second cutting means are arranged that rotary axes of the spindles may be aligned with each other with their rotary blades facing each other (Figs. 5 and 8A), and that each rotary blade comprises a circular cutting blade (22 and 23) having an annular hub integrally connected to one side (Fig. 7), (Fig. 10) but fails to disclose that each spindle has the rotary blade mounted with its hub directed inside, leaving no projections outside, thus permitting each cutting blade to face the counter cutting blade without anything intervening in-between and a water jet nozzle means in the vicinity of blade. Hasenau teaches that each spindle has the rotary blade mounted with its hub directed inside, leaving no projections outside, thus permitting each cutting blade to face the counter cutting blade without anything intervening in-between (E). Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 3724

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Ishiwata et al. with rotary blades mounted with its hub directed inside, as taught by Hasenau, allowing the blades to come closer together permitting the cutting of narrow work pieces.

Gerber teaches a water jet nozzle means in the vicinity of blade (Column 6 lines 44-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Ishiwata et al. with a water jet nozzle means, as taught by Gerber, to cool the blade.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishiwata et al. in view of Hasenau and Gerber as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Farnworth et al. Ishiwata et al., Hasenau, and Gerber disclose the invention but fail to disclose a blade defect detecting means comprising light emitting and light receiving elements. Farnworth et al. teaches a blade defect detecting means comprising light emitting and light receiving elements (Column 3 lines 11-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Ishiwata et al. in view of Hasenau and Gerber with a blade defect detecting, as taught by Farnworth et al., to determine when a blade should be replaced.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 2 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 3724

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Prone whose telephone number is 703-605-4287.

The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, Mon - (every other) Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.



JP
November 18, 2003



Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700